



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,805	02/07/2006	Hironori Tashiro	274011US0PCT	6797
22850 7590 02/02/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER MOSS, KERI A				
ART UNIT 1797		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/02/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/539,805

Applicant(s)

TASHIRO ET AL.

Examiner

KERI A. MOSS

Art Unit

1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KERI A. MOSS, Junior Examiner.(3) Kirsten Gruneberg, Ph.D. Attorney for Applicant.(2) Maureen Wallenhorst, Primary Examiner.(4) Dr. Toshiya Abiko, representative for Assignee.

Date of Interview: 27 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed New claims 4-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Larson and Melvin.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, 2nd paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clarify how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art, Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having "consisting of" in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Keri A. Moss/
Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/Maureen M. Wallenhorst/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797